Accepted for publication in *Astrophysical Journal*, part 2, July 9, 1999
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style emulateapj v. 04/03/99

arXiv:astro-ph/9907132v2 13 Jul 1999

PSR 0943+10: A BARE STRANGE STAR?

R.X.Xu[1,2], G.J.Qiao[4,1,2], Bing Zhang[3]

Accepted for publication in Astrophysical Journal, part 2, July 9, 1999

ABSTRACT

Recent work by Rankin & Deshpande strongly suggests that there exist strong "micro-storms" rotating around the magnetic axis of the 1.1s pulsar PSR 0943+10. Such a feature hints that most probably the large-voltage vacuum gap proposed by Ruderman & Sutherland (RS) does exist in the pulsar polar cap. However, there are severe arguments against the formation of the RS-type gap in pulsars, since the binding energies of both the ^{56}Fe ions and the electrons in a neutron star's surface layer is too small to prevent thermionic ejection of the particles from the surface. Here we propose that PSR 0943+10 (probably also most of the other "drifting" pulsars) might be bare strange stars rather than normal neutron stars, in which the "binding energy" at the surface is merely infinity either for the case of "pulsar" or "anti-pulsar". It is further proposed that identifying a drifting pulsar as an anti-pulsar is the key criterion to distinguish strange stars from neutron stars.

Subject headings: pulsars: general – pulsars: individual: PSR 0943+10 – stars: neutron – elementary particles

1. INTRODUCTION

A wealth of observations has been collected for pulsars since the discovery of them more than thirty years ago. However, some important discrepancies still remain in our understanding of the particle acceleration mechanisms, the emission processes, and even the nature of pulsars. It is commonly agreed that there exists an inner accelerator near the magnetic polar cap region of a pulsar, but two subclasses of models appear in the literatures. The space-charge-limited flow models (Sturrock 1971; Arons & Scharlemann 1979; Arons 1983; Muslimov & Tsygan 1992; Harding & Muslimov 1998) assume free ejection of particles of either sign from the star surface. Another type of models, however, assumes that certain particles (usually ions) could be bound in the surface layer of the star, so that a vacuum gap can form and keep breaking down to generate "sparks" continuously (Ruderman & Sutherland 1975, hereafter RS75; Usov & Melrose 1995, 1996, hereafter UM95, UM96; Zhang & Qiao 1996; Zhang et al. 1997). Both subclasses of models have some observational supports, and it is very likely, different kinds of accelerators may exist in different pulsars.

Maybe the strongest observational support to the RS-type vacuum gap model is the regular "drifting" of the subpulses observed from some pulsars. In such a model, the sparks produced by inner gap breakdown provide the source of the subpulses, and $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ drift due to the lack of charges within the gap causes the observed "drifting" phenomena. In their original paper (RS75), Ruderman & Sutherland has treated the "drifting sparking" process carefully in a detailed calculable way to get predicted value of P_3 to be directly comparable with the observations. This was not done by any other models hitherto known.

However, the RS model encounters severe theoretical criticisms known as the so-called "binding energy problem". Even if it has been modified by different ways either by introducing partial screening of the parallel electric fields (UM95; UM96) or by reducing gap height with inverse Compton scattering-induced breakdown (Zhang & Qiao 1996; Zhang et al. 1997), the formation of such vacuum gaps is still suspected, since calculations using various methods show that the binding energy of the ^{56}Fe ions is much lower than what is required to maintain a vacuum gap or simply there is no binding at all (e.g. Flowers et al. 1977; Müller 1984; Jones 1986; Neuhauser, Koonin, & Langanke 1987; Kössl et al. 1988). Furthermore, The RS model is only viable for the case of anti-parallel rotator, i.e., $\mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{B} < 0$, which they defined as "pulsars". In such a geometry, positive charges are expected to dwell on the polar cap, and a vacuum gap could be formed if positive ions *could* be bound within the molecular lattice of the star layer. For a parallel rotator with $\mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{B} > 0$, however, copious negative electrons could flow freely out from the surface, so that a vacuum gap will never form. This is referred to as "antipulsars" in the RS's term.

Recently Deshpande and Rankin have developed a technique for "mapping" the pattern of polar cap sparks or "micro-storms". They studied the typical drifting pulsar PSR 0943+10 applying this technique and came to a clear map of the polar cap sparking pattern of this pulsar (Rankin & Deshpande 1998, Deshpande & Rankin 1999; for popular report, see Glanz 1999). Their results strongly suggest that the RS vacuum gap does exist in this pulsar's polar cap. Vivekanand & Joshi (1999) also independently came to the similar conclusion by studying the competing

[1]Beijing Astronomical Observatory and National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Science (CAS), Beijing 100012, P.R. China

[2]CAS-PKU Beijing Astrophysics Center and Astronomy Department, Peking University (PKU), Beijing 100871, P.R. China. emails: RXXU@bac.pku,edu.cn, gjn@pku.edu.cn

[3]Laboratory of High Energy Astrophysics, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771. National Research Council Research Associate. email:bzhang@twinkie.gsfc.nasa.gov

[4]China Center of Advanced Science and Technology (World Laboratory), P.O. Box 8730, Beijing 100080, P.R. China

drifting subpulses in PSR 0031-07, and argued that "there is a genuine need to reinvestigate the theoretical basis of this model" (RS model). All these again pose the question how certain charged particles can be bound in the star surface. The question becomes more severe if the drifting pulsar can be identified as an "anti-pulsar"[5].

On the other hand, another kind of astrophysical objects, the strange stars, have been widely discussed (e.g. Witten 1984; Alcock, Farhi, & Olinto 1986). Trying to find criteria to distinguish strange stars from neutron stars not only is an interesting topic in astrophysics, but will, also exert important impact on fundamental physics. However, there seems to be no evident criteria since strange stars are analogous to neutron stars in many aspects (for recent review, see Lu 1998). Specifically, the canonical strange star models all invoke a solid crust which is composed of normal matters (Alcock, Farhi, & Olinto 1986; Glendenning & Weber 1992; Huang & Lu 1997). This makes strange stars indistinguishable from neutron stars in appearance. Hence, all the difficulties faced by the RS vacuum gap model for neutron stars still remain.

Recently, Xu & Qiao (1998, hereafter XQ98) proposed that a magnetosphere similar to that of a neutron star could also be formed outside a bare strange star, so that bare strange stars can act as pulsars as well. Here we'll show that an RS-type vacuum gap can be well formed above the surface of a bare strange star both for the case of $\mathbf{\Omega}\cdot\mathbf{B}<0$ *and* the case of $\mathbf{\Omega}\cdot\mathbf{B}>0$ (anti-pulsar). We suggest that PSR 0943+10 and other drifting pulsars might be bare strange stars rather than normal neutron stars.

2. BINDING ENERGY PROBLEM IN RS MODEL FOR NEUTRON STARS OR STRANGE STARS WITH CRUSTS

The essential condition of the RS vacuum gap model is that certain charged particles could be bound in the star surface, so that a boundary condition of $\mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{B}\neq 0$ is satisfied at the surface. In their original work (RS75), Ruderman & Sutherland have set two criteria to judge whether ions are bound in the surface. These two criteria were later more evidently presented by Usov & Melrose (UM95): 1. whether thermionic emission is important: i.e., whether the surface temperature is in excess of a critical "unbound" temperature; or 2. whether field emission is important: i.e., whether the parallel electric field is in excess of a critical "unbound" field value. Both the critical temperatures and the critical electric fields are determined by the work functions of the particles. For electrons, the work function is just their Fermi energy, which reads $w_{\rm e,NS}=\epsilon_{\rm F}=\frac{2\pi^4\hbar^4c^2}{e^2B^2m_{\rm e}}n_{\rm e}^2\simeq 1.03\times10^{-63}B_{12}^{-2}n_{\rm e}^2$, where $n_{\rm e}$ is the electron number density (Ruderman 1971; Flower et al. 1977; UM95). For ^{56}Fe ions, the work function is the cohesive energy per ion in the *assumed* magnetic metal, which is quite uncertain, since this small number is the difference of two large numbers (e.g. Müller 1984). UM95 has adopted $w_{\rm i,NS}=\Delta\epsilon_{\rm c}\simeq(0.9{\rm keV})B_{12}^{0.73}$ following Abrahams & Shapiro (1991). However, the error of the calculation is of the order of this value itself. Thus it is possible that there might be no cohesive energy at all.

The critical temperature for thermionic emission to be important is calculated by equating the current density due to thermionic emission (which is $\propto\exp(-w/kT)$, see eq.[12] of RS75 and eq.[2.10] of UM95) with the Goldreich-Julian (1969) charge density $n_{\rm GJ}ec$, where $n_{\rm GJ}\simeq\Omega B/(2\pi ce)$. For the case of a parallel rotator ($\mathbf{\Omega}\cdot\mathbf{B}>0$, i.e. anti-pulsar), electrons are expected to be pulled out from the surface. Adopting the density at surface as $\rho\simeq(4\times10^3{\rm g\ cm^{-3}})B_{12}^{6/5}A_{56}Z_{26}^{-3/5}$ and noticing $n_{\rm e}=\rho/m_{\rm p}\left(\frac{Z}{A}\right)$, the work function of electrons is then ~ 0.8 keV. Thus the critical temperature for electron thermion ejection is $T_{\rm cri,e}\simeq(3.7\times10^5{\rm K})Z_{26}^{4/5}B_{12}^{2/5}$ (UM95; UM96). For an anti-parallel rotator ($\mathbf{\Omega}\cdot\mathbf{B}<0$, i.e. pulsar), however, potential difference at the pulsar polar cap tends to pull ^{56}Fe ions from the surface, if the star is a neutron star or a strange star with a crust. With $w_{\rm i,NS}\sim 0.9$ keV, one can get $T_{\rm cri,i}\simeq(3.5\times10^5{\rm K})B_{12}^{0.73}$ (UM95; UM96).

Given the work function w and $E_\parallel$, another particle ejection mechanism is the field emission, which is a quantum mechanical tunneling effect and is only relevant when thermionic ejection is unimportant. Again, by equating the current density of the tunneling with the Goldreich-Julian density, one gets the critical field to pull certain particles out via field ejection (UM95) $E_{\parallel,{\rm cri}}\simeq(6\times10^{10}{\rm Vcm^{-1}})\left(\frac{w}{1{\rm keV}}\right)^{3/2}$, where w is the work function of the particle.

In the RS model, the parallel electric field at surface is $E_\parallel=2\Omega Bh/c$, where h is the gap height. With (22) of RS75, one gets $E_{\parallel,{\rm CR}}\simeq(6.3\times10^8{\rm Vcm^{-1}})B_{12}^{3/7}P^{-4/7}$, which is smaller than $E_{\parallel,{\rm cri}}$ for most cases. It was found that the inverse Compton scattering (ICS) induced cascade gaps usually have much smaller gap heights, potentials, as well as the surface electric fields (Zhang & Qiao 1996; Zhang et al. 1997; Zhang, Qiao, & Han 1997). With (12) of Zhang, Qiao & Han (1997), we get even smaller parallel electric fields as $E_{\parallel,{\rm ICS}}\simeq(1.4\times10^8{\rm Vcm^{-1}})P^{-2/3}$ for the "resonant" ICS induced gaps. Thus, usually field emission is not important for the charge ejection both for the electrons and ions.

The thermion ejection, however, is important for both cases. Pulsar polar cap temperature could be estimated self-consistently by the feedback of the inward particle streams, which is $T=(\frac{\gamma m_{\rm e}c^2\Omega B}{2\pi e\sigma})^{1/4}$ by assuming a Goldreich-Julian density, where $\sigma=5.67\times10^{-5}{\rm erg\ cm^{-2}\ K^{-4}\ s^{-1}}$ and γ is the typical Lorentz factor of the primary particles accelerated within the gap. This turns out to be $T_{\rm CR}\simeq(3.1\times10^6{\rm K})B_{12}^{3/14}P^{-2/7}$ for CR-induced gap model (RS75), and $T_{\rm ICS}\simeq(1.5\times10^6{\rm K})P^{-1/3}$ for the ICS-induced gap model (using eq.[14] of Zhang, Qiao & Han 1997), which are much higher than $T_{\rm cri,e}$ and $T_{\rm cri,i}$. Furthermore, hot polar caps with temperature $>10^6$K have been observed (e.g. Wang & Halpern 1997). This makes the thermionic ejection of both electrons and ions important in most cases and is referred as the "binding energy problem" of the RS-type vacuum gap model. This conclusion is more robust for anti-pulsars, and the large error bar of the ion cohesive energy also only leaves little room for the solution of the binding energy problem

[5]PSR 0943+10 was reported to be an anti-pulsar in Rankin & Deshpande (1998), but this conclusion is not solid (Rankin 1999, personal communication).

for pulsars.

The critical temperatures $T_{\rm cri,e}$ and $T_{\rm cri,i}$ could be raised in stronger magnetic fields. Usov & Melrose (UM95; UM96) thus developed a modified RS-type model which operates in strong field pulsars with $B \geq 0.1B_{\rm c} \sim 4.4 \times 10^{12}$G, where $B_{\rm c} \simeq 4.4 \times 10^{13}$G is the critical magnetic field. However, in their "self-consistent" model, the gap is still not completely vacuum, since they invoked a partial screening of $E_{\|}$ so as to keep the inflow current not be able to heat the surface to above the critical temperatures. Though they didn't discuss the "sparking" and "drifting" process in such model, the results should be quite different from the RS's predictions.

3. PSR 0943+10 AS A BARE STRANGE STAR

Rankin & Deshpande's work (Rankin & Deshpande 1998, Deshpande & Rankin 1999) showed that, at least for PSR 0943+10, the drifting sparking patterns just closely match the prediction of the RS model. In fact, Rankin addressed that the RS model "is the only reasonably complete explanation for the hot spots at the moment" (Glanz 1999). However, the above-mentioned binding energy problem makes it difficult to understand the formation of an RS gap in this pulsar if the pulsar is a neutron star or a strange star with a crust. Even the modified partial screening gap model proposed by Usov & Melrose could not heal it since PSR 1943+10 has a relative long period of 1.1 second, and a moderate surface field strength of 2.0×10^{12}G (or 4.0×10^{12}G as Usov & Melrose argued), which is well located outside the "self-consistent" region of Usov & Melrose (region 2 of Fig.1 of UM96). We'll show here that a sound answer could be obtained if this pulsar is actually a *bare strange star* (BSS).

The main objection of BSSs acting as pulsars lies in the superstrong electric fields near the star surfaces (Alcock, Farhi, & Olinto 1986). However, Xu & Qiao (XQ98) showed that the electric field due to the non-neutral effect of strange stars near a bare strange star's surface actually decreases rapidly. A handy calculation using Alcock et al's equation (14) comes to the conclusion that the parallel electric field strength will drop from the high value of $\sim 5 \times 10^{17}$V cm^{-1} down to 10^{10}V cm^{-1} within a height of $z_{\rm c} \sim 10^{-7}$cm, where rotation-induced electric fields begin to dominate (XQ98). Just define an "effective" BSS surface at $z_{\rm c}$, a magnetosphere like that of a normal neutron star could be formed right above this effective surface within a short time scale once some high energy γ-ray seeds can ignite pair production cascade (XQ98). A BSS can hence act as a pulsar.

The key advantage of such a BSS model is that a BSS can completely prevent both the thermionic and field ejections of any charged particles from the surface. In other words, the binding energy of the particles in the pulsar surface is merely infinity. For the case of $\mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{B} < 0$ (pulsar case), this conclusion is just straight forward, since the positive charges within the surface are u quarks rather than ions. The homopolar generated strong fields are solely negligible with respect to the strong interaction operating between the quarks. Thus essentially $w_{\rm q,BSS} \rightarrow \infty$. For the case of $\mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{B} > 0$ (anti-pulsar case) in a BSS, the situation is a little bit complex. The interaction to prevent electrons from ejection is also the electromagnetic force. However, by defining the effective surface of BSS at $z_{\rm c}$, the picture could be simplified. At the effective surface, the homopolar field strength is just equal to the "binding" field strength, so that the "field ejection" condition fails below it. The "thermionic ejection" condition, on the other hand, also fails just slightly below the effective surface. This is because that, the electric fields increase rapidly inwards below $z_{\rm c}$, so that the binding energy of the electrons at z, $w_{\rm e,BSS} = \int_{z_{\rm c}}^{z} (dV/dz)dz$ also increases rapidly. Note again that the thermionic emission current density is proportional to $\exp(-w/kT)$ (RS75, UM95), and that the critical temperature is defined by equating this current density with the Goldreich-Julian density, then the critical temperature in this BSS case is just proportional to $w_{\rm e,BSS}$ and therefore also increases tremendously slightly below the effective surface. As a result, only a very thin layer of electrons could be thermionically ejected, and contribute a negligible current density, so that a vacuum gap analogous to the RS-type could be formed.

There is a little difference between such kind of gap (rooted on a BSS) and the original RS-gap (rooted on a NS). The key point is that besides the homopolar generated electric field, there is also an intrinsic electric field due to the attraction of the strange quark matters from the BSS. However, the rapidly decreasing behavior of this intrinsic or background field (Fig.1 in XQ98) makes it play an negligible role. Thus we can safely say that a gap rooted on a BSS can completely reproduce all the features of the RS model, which can interpret the work of Deshpande & Rankin (1999) successfully. In this sense, we suggest that PSR 0943+10 might be a *bare strange star* rather than a normal neutron star. As shown above, this argument is more promising if it can be inferred from the observations that the star is an "anti-pulsar". We further suggest that other drifting pulsars (e.g. Rankin 1986) might also be BSSs since most of them have the similar period and surface field strengths as PSR 0943+10, and the binding energy problem could not be released if their gaps are rooted on neutron stars or strange stars with crusts.

4. CONCLUSION & DISCUSSION

We have shown in this *Letter* that the lack of theories to solve the binding energy problem of the RS model rooted on a neutron star has led us to present the idea that PSR 0943+10 as well as other clearly drifting pulsars might be bare strange stars. Though the argument in favor of the BSS model is indirect, it seems that this is the only hitherto known sound model to solve the binding energy problem completely.

There are some arguments against the formation of the BSSs or even strange stars. In their pioneer paper, Alcock, Farhi & Olinto (1986) simply addressed that "a bare strange star may readily accrete some ambient material" since "the universe is a dirty environment". Though firmly concluding that all accreting X-ray pulsars have crusts, they admitted however that "the situation with radio pulsars is harder to assess", and that "the rotating magnetosphere is likely to prevent fluid accretion". Thus as long as the fallback materials do not form a crust during the supernova explosion when a strange star were born, the BSS could remain bare for a sufficient long period of time before its rotation is too slow to prevent materials to drop onto its polar cap. At this stage, usually pulsars have died out

across the "death lines" or "death valleys" (RS75; Chen & Ruderman 1993; Qiao & Zhang 1996). Thus it is plausible to say that observed pulsars could be BSSs.

Perhaps the most severe argument against the existence of strange stars is the "glitching" phenomena observed from some pulsars, which is commonly interpreted as the starquakes happened in a solid crust. Even for strange stars with solid crusts, Alpar (1987) argued that the observed magnitude of $\Delta\dot{\Omega}/\dot{\Omega} \sim 10^{-2} - 10^{-3}$ poses a strong objection to such an idea, since strange stars' crusts are not thick enough. These arguments are not in conflict with our idea that drifting pulsars might be BSSs. By comparing the samples of the drifting pulsars (Table 2 of Rankin 1986) and the samples of the glitching pulsars (Table 6.2 of Lyne & Graham-Smith 1998), we found remarkably that, all other drifting pulsars were never observed to show glitching behavior except for PSR 0525+21, which is one of the few pulsars with surface magnetic field higher than 10^{13}G. In such a high field, the gap of the UM96's type or even RS75's type could be formed in a *neutron star* surface, since the binding energies are greatly enhanced. Furthermore, glitching behavior might also be interpreted by the BSS models, if stable, low-baryon number strangelets could exist and form a solid crust (Benvenuto & Horvath 1990). Thus observed glitches "should not be used to dismiss the possibility of strange stars" (Madsen 1998).

Another possible objection of our idea may come from strong thermal X-ray emissions from drifting pulsars, since the bare quark matter surface of a strange star is a very poor radiator itself. Spectral analysis of some spin-powered X-ray pulsars (e.g. Becker & Trümper 1997) reveals that the X-ray spectra can be fitted by either a power-law radiation (non-thermal magnetospheric origin), a thermal emission from the full surface (mainly due to the cooling or the internal heating), a thermal emission from the hot polar cap (due to inner gap or outer gap heating), or a combination of above two or three components. Our model actually predicts that *the full surface thermal emission from the drifting pulsars should be strongly suppressed*. Four pulsars, i.e., Vela, Geminga, PSR 0656+16, and PSR 1055-52, are observed to show strong thermal emission from the full surface. But they are not drifting pulsars, and thus can not dismiss our idea. Future X-ray observation and spectral analysis on drifting pulsars can prove or dismiss the idea that drifting pulsars are BSSs.

The final question is whether a strange star could be formed in the supernova explosion at all. No definite answer is available yet. Nevertheless, as argued in XQ98, the birth of a strange star rather than a neutron star could enhance both the successful possibilities of supernova explosion and the energy of the revived shock wave, due to the additional energy source of phase transition from two-flavor quark matter to three-flavor quark matter (Dai, Peng, & Lu 1995).

In principle, a BSS model can mend the RS vacuum gap model to have a much more solid foundation. The existence of such a gap can benefit the inverse Compton scattering model of pulsars (Qiao & Lin 1998), which can interpret naturally the long identified pulsar "core" emission (Rankin 1983; Lyne & Manchester 1988).

The idea presented here also adds one more criterion to distinguish strange stars from neutron stars. As shown above, the arguments in favor of the BSSs are more promising for the anti-pulsar case. Unfortunately, the drifting direction does not depend on whether the star is a pulsar or an anti-pulsar. Thus seeking other observational methods to tell the sense of the magnetic pole of a pulsar is essential. We propose here that *finding and identifying a drifting anti-pulsar will be a strong argument in favor of the existence of the (bare) strange stars in nature.*

We sincerely thank Joanna Rankin for discussing her recent work (with Deshpande) with us, the anonymous referee for insightful suggestions, and M. Vivekanand for valuable comments. Helpful discussions from J.L. Han and other members of our pulsar group are acknowledged. This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundations (No.19673001 and No. 19803001) of China, the Climbing Program of State Committee of Science and Technology of China, the Research Fund for Doctoral Program of Higher Education, and the Youth Science Foundation of Peking University.

REFERENCES

Abrahams, A.M., & Shapiro, S.L. 1991, ApJ, 374, 652
Alcock, C., Farhi, E., & Olinto, A. 1986, ApJ, 310, 261
Alpar, M.A. 1987, Phys. Rev. Lett., 58, 2152
Arons, J. 1983, ApJ, 266, 215
Arons, J., & Scharlemann, E.T. 1979, ApJ, 231, 845
Becker, W., & Trümper, J. 1997, A&A, 326, 682
Benvenuto, O.G., & Horvath, J.E. 1990, MNRAS, 247, 584
Chen, K., & Ruderman, M.A. 1993, ApJ, 402, 264
Dai, Z.G., Peng, Q.H., & Lu, T. 1995, ApJ, 440, 815
Deshpande, A.A., & Rankin, J.M. 1999, ApJL, in press
Flower, E.G., Lee, J.-F., Ruderman, M.A., Sutherland, P.G., Hillebrandt, W., & Müller, E. 1977, ApJ, 215, 291
Glanz, J. 1999, Science, 283, 783
Glendenning, N.K., & Weber, F. 1992, ApJ, 400, 647
Goldreich,P., & Julian, W.H. 1969, ApJ, 157, 869
Harding, A.K., & Muslimov, A.G. 1998, ApJ, 508, 328
Huang, Y.F., & Lu, T. 1997, A&A, 325, 189
Jones, P.B. 1986, MNRAS, 218, 477
Kössl,D., Wolff,R.G., Müller,E., Hillebrandt,W. 1988, A&A 205, 347
Lu, T. 1998, In: Chan, K.L., Cheng, K.S., Singh, H.P. (eds.), 1997 Pacific Rim Conference on Stellar Astrophysics, 215 (astro-ph/9807052)
Lyne, A.G., & Graham-Smith, F., 1998, Pulsar Astronomy (2nd ed.), Cambridge University Press
Lyne, A.G., & Manchester, R.N. 1988, MNRAS 134, 477
Madsen, J. in J. Cleymans (ed) Hadrons in Dense Matter and Hadrosynthesis, Lecture notes in physics, Springer Verlag, in press (astro-ph/9809032)
Müller, E. 1984, A&A, 130, 415
Muslimov, A.G., & Tsygan, A. 1992, MNRAS, 255, 61
Neuhauser, D., Koonin, S.E.,& Langanke, K. Phys. Rev. A, 1987, 36, 4163
Qiao, G.J., & Lin, W.P. 1998, A&A, 333, 172
Qiao, G.J., & Zhang, B. 1996, A&A, 306, L5
Rankin, J.M. 1983, ApJ, 274, 333
——. 1986, ApJ, 301, 901
Rankin, J.M., & Deshpande, A.A. 1998, American Astronomical Society Meeting #193 #41.08
Ruderman, M.A. 1971, Phys. Rev. Lett., 27, 1306
Ruderman, M.A., & Sutherland, P.G. 1975, ApJ, 196, 51 (RS75)
Sturock,P.A. 1971, ApJ 164, 529
Usov, V.V., & Melrose, D.B. 1995, Aust. J. Phys., 48, 571 (UM95)
——. 1996, ApJ, 464, 306 (UM96)
Vivekanand, M. & Joshi, B.C. 1999, ApJ, 515, 398
Wang, F.Y.-H. & Halpern, J.P. 1997, ApJ, 482, L159
Witten, E. 1984, Phys. Rev. D, 30, 272
Xu,R.X., & Qiao,G.J. 1998, Chin. Phys. Lett., 15, 934 (astro-ph/9811197) (XQ98)
Zhang, B., & Qiao, G.J. 1996, A&A, 310, 135
Zhang, B., Qiao, G.J., & Han, J.L. 1997, ApJ, 491, 891
Zhang, B., Qiao, G.J., Lin, W.P., & Han, J.L. 1997, ApJ, 478, 313